

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAILS COMMITTEE

March 1, 2000  
Maricopa Association of Governments Office, Ocotillo Room  
302 North First Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona

VOTING MEMBERS

*Carl Doak, Chandler	Stacy Caudell, Peoria
*Mark Weiner, Gilbert	Brian B Pirooz, Peoria
Pat Thurman, Glendale	Jeff Van Skike, Phoenix (St. Trans.)
*David Ramirez, Goodyear	Roger Olsen, Phoenix (Water)
Ted Collins, MCDOT	*Rod Ramos, Scottsdale
Bob Erdman, MCDOT	Andy Goh, Tempe
Doug Davis, Mesa	

ADVISORY MEMBERS

James Pulice, Jr., AGC	Jeff Benedict, ARPA
*Jim Grose, AGC	Peter Kandaris, SRP Engineering
*Paul Nebeker, UTCA	Sean Goris, ACEA
Tom Domizi, UTCA	

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Paul Ward, MAG  
Laura Stegall, MAG  
Gordon Tyus

\*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:46 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The approval of the February 2, 2000, minutes were deferred to the April 5, 2000, meeting.

3. Submitted Cases

- a. **Case 00-01 - Section 750.3 - Joint Requirements:** None of the members had any questions or comments regarding this case.

4. New Cases

- a. **Case 00-02 - Section 630 - Reduced Wall Resilient Seated Gate Valves:** A short discussion was held regarding the subject. No member expressed any negative opinions about the valves. Per letter dated Dec. 6, 1999, the manufacturer, American Flow Control, requested that the valve be considered as an equal in the Specifications. Roger Olsen volunteered to be the sponsor for the change and requested that a case number be assigned.
- b. **Case 00-03 - Detail -** Andy Goh provided copies of Detail T-355 - Speed Hump from the details adopted by the City of Tempe. Because of the popularity of this detail within the area cities, Mr. Goh requested that a case be established for review, comment and approval by the MAG Committee. Mr. Goh requested comments from each member regarding the Tempe Detail. He will submit a generic detail to the Committee.
- c. **Case 00-04 - Detail -** Mr. Goh provided copies of Detail T-451 - Standard Trench Plating Detail from the details adopted by the City of Tempe. Because of the popularity of this detail within the area cities, Mr. Goh requested that a case be established for review, comment and approval by the MAG Committee. Mr. Goh requested comments from each member regarding the Tempe Detail. He will submit a generic detail to the Committee.

5. General Discussion

- a. Paul Ward introduced Gordon Tyus of the MAG Staff. Gordon has a background in AutoCAD. He, along with committees staff, has been assigned the task to develop and/or update electronic versions of the Details. Gordon explained the approach they planned to take during this process.
  - 1. Review all of the Metric Details. Standardize the line weights, correct any errors found in the review. The target date for completion of this step is one month (April 2000 meeting). Mr Tyus requested assistance from the members to review the metric drawings.
  - 2. Take the base plates of the Metric and generate the English version. This can be accomplished by setting up plates from the original drawings. One plate will be established for all metric dimensions, notes, etc. and a second plate for English dimensions, etc. The base plate will be the line work. With this method, the same base drawing can be used for both versions. The estimated time for completion of this step is 3 months (May through July).
  - 3. Review of all drawings by the committee.
  - 4. Update the new details as approved by the committee in this year's cases.
  - 5. Publishing a full set of details in Metric and English with the 2001 updates (Jan. 2001).

MAG Staff discussed several items regarding the details with the members. The following is a summary of the discussed items:

- \* The sizes (widths) of the lines could be reviewed further, e.g., in the Metric version, the widths of the dimension lines are very close (in width) to the object lines.
- \*A revision date could be placed in the lower corner of the detail.

\*The Metric Details were not drawn to scale. This may be an advantage since the base drawing will be used in both English and Metric.

Staff will need to pay attention to the reinforcement of the structural drawings during the conversion. The number of bars noted in the notes may not be the same as shown in the drawing.

\*A short discussion followed regarding the release of the drawings to the public. If the drawings are in AutoCAD, the details are subject to easy modifications by various people that use them. This may present a problem for contractors and City Inspectors to catch any slight changes that may occur on the drawing.

- b. Mr. Ward provided a correction sheet to the 2000 Revisions to the Specifications (pages 795-1 and 795-2).
  - c. Bob Erdman requested the status of the 2000 Metric Revisions. Laura Stegall informed the committee that they will be ready for purchase by next month.
  - d. Jeff Van Skike asked if any agency had any experience with the plastic (polypropylene) adjustment rings. Several agencies (Glendale, MCDOT) have used the rings with success. The rings work well when a uniform layer of asphalt is placed on the street. The only problem occurs when the street is milled to a sloping or uneven profile. The uniform adjustment ring will not work.
  - e. Mr. Erdman asked the Committee if they had any plans or would have interest in modifying Section 321 in the areas of corrective action. Several members agreed that changes are needed. Doug Davis stated that Mesa has intentions to modify the subsection by amendments to the MAG Specifications. Based on the comments, Bob will be looking into the possibility of a creating a case.
  - f. In the last meeting, Jeff Benedict requested several changes to be incorporated in Section 710. He provided copies of possible changes to the members that did not attend the last meeting.
  - g. Tom Domizi has a case that will be submitted by Scottsdale. Scottsdale should submit the case at the next meeting.
  - h. Mr. Davis advised all members who are sponsoring a case and have handouts that the handouts will need to be submitted to him within the next two weeks to have them placed in next month's packet.
6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:13 p.m.